DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 675 HE 011 804

AUTHOR Collins, Janet; Nickel, K. N.
TITLE A New Look at Grading, Recording, and Averaging Practices in Higher Education in the United States.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 14p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Academic Probation; *Academic Standards; Admission Criteria; College Students; Followup Studies; *Grade Inflation; Grade Point Average; Grades (Scholastic); *Grading; Higher Education; Institutional Research; School Surveys; *Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Focusing on current grading practices, this report details a survey of 443 respondents from both four- and two-year institutions of higher education. The data are compared with a 1973-74 survey of the same institutions. Findings show that in general more stringent policies are enforced in the use of nontraditional grading practices, in making-up incompletes, in withdrawal policies, and in auditing procedures. Practices on the admission of high school graduates, admission to graduate school, and on remaining in good standing appear to have become more strict. The responses on probation and suspension indicate that these policies have become more strict, as have policies on grades awarded by instructors. It is also noted, however, that there is an increased use of nontraditional grades in courses outside the major, that there is a higher percentage of use of unlimited repeating of courses, and an increase in the practice of academic bankruptcy (where grades from a "bad" semester are not recorded). There is also an increase in the number of respondents who reported that the highest grade earned for a course is the one used to calculate the grade point average. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K. N. Nickell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED176675

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A NEW LOOK AT GRADING, RECORDING AND AVERAGING PRACTICES IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Janet Collins, Assoc. Prof., Maryville College
and St. Louis, MO
K. N. Nickell, Prof., Wichita State Univ.
Wichita, KS

The 1973-4 Study of Grading Practices in Institutions of Higher Education[1] which was reported in 1974 at the annual AACTAO meeting in Atlanta presented a look at the practices of some 544 two- and four-year institutions of higher education. The report of this study in 1974 reflected many of the changes which were presumed by some to have been caused by the decade of the so-called "stormy sixties." At this time, five years after the 1973-4 survey, that study has been replicated in an attempt to determine what changes, if any, have taken place since the phenomena of nontraditional grading practices and "grade inflation" have been reported and discussed. Scully has indicated particular concern about the seriousness and extent of the grade inflation phenomenon:

> "Grade inflation" has, in fact, become one of most frequently discussed issues in higher education this year.[2]

A discussion of the reasons for grade inflation is not the purpose of this report. Current grading practices in higher education are the substance of this report. However, Scully presented several theories in his article about the causes of grade inflation and also discussed the difficulty of identifying important factors relating to this phenomenon.[3]

The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education reported in 1977 on a survey conducted in 1975 which included many of the same questions as an earlier survey. One of the findings reported in 1977 was:

> Interest in radical academic reform has waned. In 1969, a majority of undergraduates and a third of the nation's faculty members agreed ("strongly" or "with reservations") that undergraduate education in America would be improved if grades were abolished. In 1975, the proportion of students and faculty members endorsing that idea dropped to less than one-third for students and to about one-fifth for faculty members.[4]

The Carnegie Council survey results and other reports might be interpreted as indicating a trend toward stricter, more traditional practices in grading in higher education. However, the reverse is indicated to some degree by the many institutions that do not use grades or use less-punitive types and by the comment from one of the responders in the 1978-9 study.

HE011 504

> Let's stamp out grades and eliminate a lot of work!

It is not the purpose of this presentation to discuss grades as to their value, their appropriateness or their authenticity. Certainly, each of these factors could be discussed at length--particularly, in view of a statement in an article titled, "The Sound of Musicgrams."

> ...there was a failing student who implored his professor, via Music Box, to give him a D instead of an F. The professor was so impressed with the musical message he gave the student more than he asked for---a C.[5]

It is rather commonly known that grades are determined by many and various factors and standards--some rather strange. Most persons in higher education, though, would argue that grades are a necessity as a measurement of educational progress even though there may be no agreed-upon criteria for determining grades nor any consistency in awarding and/or computing them. The Carnegie Council Survey and some responders" comments indicated that there is some feeling for abolishing grades. However, the majority in higher education insist that grades are a necessity for other reasons in addition to measuring educational progress such as transfer of credit among institutions of higher education.

A somewhat contrasting view was pointed out by Astin when he voiced some doubts about grades or credits.

> The main function of the credit system in American higher education is presumably to translate information about the student's knowledge and achievement into a form that will permit the conferring of appropriate degrees and certificates. These degrees are in turn used by prospective employers and graduate and professional schools to evaluate the person being screened. The credit system, therefore, serves no fundamental educational purpose, but is used rather as a device for sorting and selecting persons for jobs and for admission to some higher level of education.[6]

In spite of this and other views, it appears that grades, in one form or another, will continue to be used by most institutions of higher education but the form/procedures may differ drastically. Thus, questions with regard to grading, recording and averaging practices are most pertinent.

A replica of the 1973-4 survey form were sent to 530 institutions which had participated in the 1973-4 study. Four hundred forty-three responses were received. The return total included 319 four-year institutions (191 public and 128 private) and 124 two-year institutions (95 public and 29 private) of higher education. Unfortunately, several of the institutions that participated in the 1973-4 survey had closed their doors or were no longer available to respond. Certainly, it is very appropriate for the researchers to thank all of those who expended the time and energy to respond to all 44 items on the survey form. It is not possible, obviously, to prepare one form which would be appropriate for all grading systems with their many complexities and differing practices. The efforts of the 443 responders to fit their systems

to the survey form and to provide appropriate data are greatly appreciated. In fact, one responding institution appended a bill for $25.00 for reimbursement for the responder's time and the secretarial work in responding to the survey. Incidentally, the bill was marked paid. Thus, with a great deal of assistance from many registrars and admissions officers across the country, a new look at grading, recording and averaging practices in higher education in the United States is herewith presented.

The data from the 1978-9 survey are presented in the following tables in comparison with data from the 1973-4 survey. It is important to note that the comparisons are in percentage form since the number of forms sent out and returned were different in 1978-9 (443) from those in 1973-4 (544). In 1978-9, the 443 returns represent slightly more than an 83% return. In addition to the data in the tables, comments added by the respondents are presented in the appendix. In many instances, the comments add an important supplementary dimension to the data which are presented in Tables I through V.

GRADING PRACTICES.

In Table I, items 1 & 2 on grades being assigned and/or changed by instructors showed little change from the previous study. However, the practice of grades being changed by a college administrator (#3) and/or by an appeal committee (#4) increased in the most recent study. It could be concluded that these data gave some indication of a trend toward more conservative practices. However, while the differences are marked, these data are not considered sufficient evidence to indicate a trend.

The responses on the use of nontraditional grading practices (#5-11) presented a somewhat divergent impression. The data on the use of all-inclusive grades or neuter grades (#5) showed a slightly lower percentage of use in the 1978-9 survey. On items concerning the use of Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory designations, percentages of use in any course (#6) were the same in both surveys while the percentage of use in courses outside the major field only (#7) was higher in 1978-9. The percentage of use of Credit/NoCredit grades in any course (#8) declined in 1978-9 but the responses with regard to use of Cr/NCr grades in courses outside the major field only (#9) indicated an increase in use. On item (#10), the use of Pass/Fail grades in any course, the percentage of use declined in 1978-9 but the use in courses outside the major field only (#11) increased. When the responses in items 6, 8 and 10 are totalled, the 1973-4 survey had 50.2% usage and the 1978-9 had 44.0%, a distinct decrease. However, when the responses in items 7, 9 and 11 were totalled, the 1973-4 study had 51.8% usage and the 1978-9 survey showed 56.9%, a distinct increase. These results indicate a move toward more traditional grading in courses in the major and a trend in the opposite direction in the usage of nontraditional grades in courses outside the major. An additional factor from the 1978-9 survey is that many comments on the use of nontraditional grades in certain designated courses were not included in the percentages of use which were reported in most instances. These additional comments add to the reported increase of use in courses outside the major. Comments to the effect that instead of Pass/Fail the institution used Pass/NoCredit also implemented the trend toward increasing use of nontraditional grades and grade inflation.

TABLE I

GRADING PRACTICES

Survey Item	1973-4 Survey		1978-8 Survey	
	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
1. All grades are assigned by the course instructors	535	98.4	443	100.0
2. Grades may be changed only by the course instructor	497	91.4	403	91.0
3. Grades may be changed by a college administrator	51	9.4	61	13.8
4. Grades may be changed by an appeal committee	117	21.5	124	28.0
5. All-inclusive grades (neuter grades) such as N or X may be given in lieu of F, I, or WD grades	82	15.1	62	14.0
6. Satisfactory/unsatisfactory (S/U) may be given in any course	75	13.8	61	13.8
7. S/U grades may be given in courses outside the major field only	60	11.0	53	12.00
8. Credit/No Credit (Cr/NCr) grades may be given in any course	104	19.1	68	15.4
9. Cr/NCr grades may be given in courses outside the major field only	72	13.1	68	15.4
10. Pass/Fail (P/F) grades may be given in any course	94	17.3	64	14.4
11. P/F courses may be given in courses outside the major field only	150	27.6	131	29.6

Note: The 1973-4 percentages are based on 544 returns
The 1978-9 percentages are based on 443 returns

The responses presented in Table II are concerned with making-up incompletes, withdrawing from courses, and auditing courses (#12-20). While these factors are not grading practices per se, they are important as far as a student's overall grade point average is concerned. Each of these factors may affect a student's GPA positively or negatively to the degree that the student may not be allowed to continue in school, may not be admitted to graduate school, or may not be recommended for a position. Consequently, the practices for making-up incompletes, the procedures for withdrawing from courses, and the policies with regard to auditing courses are germane to this report. The data in item 12, no time limit for making-up incompletes, showed a definite decline in the 1978-9 study. The responses to item 13, time for making-up incompletes is limited, had almost the same percentage responses in both survey although slightly lower in 1978-9. The modal response in item 13 for the amount of time for making-up incompletes was "up to one complete term of the next regular enrollment" on both surveys.

The responses on withdrawing indicated that the percentages on withdrawing at any time without penalty (#14) declined markedly in the 1978-9 survey. Item 15, withdrawing at any time without penalty only if passing, showed a small decline in percentage responses in the 1978-9 study. The largest number of responses were for item 16, withdrawing without penalty only if passing and during a certain period of time. The 1973-4 study had 47.3% while the 1978-9 survey had 57.1%, a distinct difference. Both surveys had the same modal response with regard to the amount of time for withdrawing--up to ten weeks.

The four items on auditing (#17-20) presented some small percentage differences. The response on not requiring an auditor to do course work nor take tests (#17) was 73.7% in 1973-4 and 76.5% in 1978-9. Not repeating an audited course for a letter grade (#18) showed responses of 24.3% in 1973-4 and 19.2% in 1978-9. Item 19 on not using an audited course as a prerequisite showed a 44.1% response in 1973-4 and 47.6% in 1978-9. The tuition cost of auditing as the same as for a credit course (#20) showed a 57.5% response in 1973-4 and 59.4% in 1978-9.

There appears to be more stringency evident in the 1978-9 data in all three areas, making-up incompletes, withdrawing from courses, and the items concerned with auditing. The differences in percentage response, in general, indicate a stricter accounting was required of the students in 1978-9.

RECORDING PRACTICES.

The data presented in Table III provide some interesting comparisons. Item 22, a grade for each course attempted is recorded, had almost the some percentage response in both studies. The percentages on repeating courses with F grades (#23) declined somewhat in 1978-9. However, the percentages in item 24, repeating courses with D or F grades, and in item 25, repeating any course regardless of grade, increased from 81.3% and 55.7% in 1973-4 to 83.7% and 61.2% in 1978-9. In addition, several respondents indicated only #25 or #24 as either included #23. These increases coupled with the point that the majority

TABLE II

INCOMPLETES, WITHDRAWALS & AUDITING

Survey Item	1973-4 Survey Number of Responses	1973-4 Survey Percent of Responses	1978-9 Survey Number of Responses	1978-9 Survey Percent of Responses
12. There is no time limit for making-up incomplete grades	60	11.0	33	7.4
13. Time for making-up incomplete grades is limited	496	91.2	400	90.3
14. A student may withdraw from any course at any time without penalty	125	23.0	63	14.2
15. A student may withdraw from any course at any time without penalty only if passing at the time of withdrawal	61	11.2	41	9.3
16. A student may withdraw without penalty from any course only if passing and during a certain period of time	257	47.3	253	57.1
17. A student auditing a course is not required to do course work nor take course tests	401	73.7	339	76.5
18. An audited course may not be repeated for a letter grade	132	24.3	85	19.2
19. An audited course may not be used as a pre-requisite to take an advanced course	240	44.1	211	47.6
20. The tuition cost of an audited course is the same as for the course for credit	313	57.5	263	59.4

TABLE III

RECORDING PRACTICES

Survey Item	1973-3 Survey Number of Responses	1973-3 Survey Percent of Responses	1978-9 Survey Number of Responses	1978-9 Survey Percent of Responses
22. A GRADE FOR EACH COURSE ATTEMPTED IS RECORDED ON A STUDENT'S TRANSCRIPT	495	91.0	402	90.7
*23. STUDENTS MAY REPEAT COURSES IN WHICH THEY RECEIVE GRADES OF F	495	91.0	385	86.9
**24. STUDENTS MAY REPEAT COURSES IN WHICH THEY RECEIVE GRADES OF D OR F	442	81.3	371	83.7
***25. STUDENTS MAY REPEAT ANY COURSE REGARDLESS OF THE PREVIOUS GRADE	303	55.7	271	61.2
26. A POLICY OF "ACADEMIC BANKRUPTCY" IS FOLLOWED WHERE GRADES RECEIVED IN A "BAD" SEMESTER ARE NOT RECORDED	21	3.9	38	8.6
27. FAILING GRADES (F) ARE NOT RECORDED ON A STUDENT'S TRANSCRIPT	45	8.3	16	3.7
28. GRADES OF D AND F ARE NOT RECORDED ON A STUDENT'S TRANSCRIPT	21	3.9	8	1.8

*IN 1973-4, 279 OF THE 495 INDICATED "NO LIMIT" ON REPEATS (56.4%)
IN 1978-9, 241 OF THE 385 INDICATED "NO LIMIT" ON REPEATS (62.6%)

**IN 1973-4, 241 OF THE 442 INDICATED "NO LIMIT" ON REPEATS (54.5%)
IN 1978-9, 224 OF THE 371 INDICATED "NO LIMIT" ON REPEATS (60.4%)

***IN 1973-4, 189 OF THE 303 INDICATED "NO LIMIT" ON REPEATS (62.4%)
IN 1978-9, 191 OF THE 271 INDICATED "NO LIMIT" ON REPEATS (70.5%)

response to the question, repeat how may times, was "no limit" on all three items on both surveys and that the "no limit" percentages increased from 56.4% in 1973-4 to 62.6% in 1978-9 on item 23, from 54.5% to 60.4% on item 24, and from 62.4% to 70.5% on item 25 indicate a move toward permitting unlimited repeating of courses. It should be noted that many respondents who designated "no limit" also stipulated that a course could only be used once in computing the GPA for graduation. These data, in the opinion of the researchers, indicate that institutions are becoming less punitive as far as being able to repeat courses is concerned.

The responses on "academic bankruptcy" (#26) where grades in a "bad" semester are not recorded showed a definite increase from 1973-4 to 1978-9 although the number of institutions utilizing one or more aspects of this practice remains small and the reported procedures vary. These data also could be interpreted as indicating a move toward less-punitive policies since the percentage responses increased from 3.9% in 1973-4 to 8.6% in 1978-9.

Item 27, not recording F grades, and 28, not recording D and F grades, showed a considerable decrease from 8.3% and 3.9% in 1973-4 to 3.7% and 1.8% in 1978-9. These decreases may have been the result of more institutions changing back to the practice of awarding D and/or F grades, the result of changing policies on recording, or the result of a combination of these and other factors. Many comments in these sections stressed that all grades were recorded. Several comments also indicated that policies had changed to awarding/recording D's and F's. A move toward more stringent accounting seems to be evidenced by the data in items 27 & 28.

AVERAGING PRACTICES.

Very little change in percentage responses was noted in items 30, using all grades from any institution in computing the GPA, and 31, only grades which count for the degree are used in computing the GPA, with percentages of 36.0 and 10.5 in 1973-4 and 35.9 and 9.7 in 1978-9. Item 32, only grades in courses taken at your institution are used in computing the GPA, showed percentage responses of 53.9 in 1973-4 and 59.4 in 1978-9. This increase may indicate a move toward stricter accounting when taken in the context of other changes in this direction.

The responses on item 33, when a course is repeated, all grades (two or more) are used in computing the GPA, decreased from 28.9% in 1973-4 to 26.9% in 1978-9. The contrasting item, #34-when a course is repeated, only the last grade received is used in computing the GPA, also had a decreasing percentage from 59.7 in 1973-4 to 50.6 in 1978-9. Although there was the decrease, both studies reported that a majority of the respondents used the practice described in item 34. In conjunction with item 34, a further note on the use of repeated courses as reported in the 1978-9 study is essential--39 of the 224 respondents to item 34 (17.4%) indicated that they used the highest or best grade when a course is repeated one or more times in computing the GPA. Since the survey form did not include this question, it was unusual that this statistic would be so evident and that the respondents would take extra time and energy to modify the form by writing this notation on the form. The percentage responses

TABLE IV

AVERAGING PRACTICES

Survey Item	1973-4 Survey Number of Responses	1973-4 Survey Percent of Responses	1978-9 Survey Number of Responses	1978-9 Survey Percent of Responses
30. All grades received in all courses taken at any institution are used in computing the overall grade point average (GPA)	196	36	159	35.9
31. Only grades in courses which count for the degree are used in computing the GPA	57	10.5	43	9.7
32. Only grades in courses taken at your institution are used in computing the GPA	293	53.9	263	59.4
33. When a course is repeated, all grades (two or more) are are used in computing the GPA	157	28.9	119	26.9
*34. When a course is repeated, only the last grade received is used in computing the GPA	325	59.7	224	50.6

*In 1978-9, 39 of the 224 responding to this item indicated that they used the highest grade of the two or more in computing the GPA (17.4%)

on items 30-34 are presented in Table IV.

GPA REQUIREMENTS.

Table V includes data on admissions, remaining in good standing, progation and suspension. The percentage responses on items 36 & 37, minimum GPA's for admission of in-state & out-of-state high school graduates, were almost identical in both surveys. However, the percentages on item 38, a minimum GPA for admission to graduate school, increased from 64.7% in 1973-4 to 73.3% in 1978-9. Item 39, requiring a minimum GPA to be in good standing, also showed an increase from 72.6% to 79.7%. The survey items on probation and suspension (#40-43) showed percentage increases overall. Placing on probation when the overall GPA falls below the minimum (#40) increased from 64.7% in 1973-4 to 77.0% in 1978-9. Placing on probation when any semester's GPA is below the minimum (#41) showed little change--40.8% and 40.6%. However, suspending a student on probation when any semester's GPA falls below the minimum (#42) showed an increase from 30.7% to 43.3%. Item 43, a student remains on probation until the overall GPA is at or above the minimum, increased from 52.8% to 59.6%. The requirement of a minimum GPA for graduation (#44) increased from 85.7% to 88.0%. These data indicate a change in that more respondents reported placing marginal students on probation or suspension. When the data for admission to graduate school, for being in good standing, and for a minimum GPA for graduation are considered along with the percentage increases in the probation and suspension items, it can be concluded that requirements for admission and retention are being applied more stringently in 1978-9 than in 1973-4.

SUMMARY.

Have the media accounts on "grade inflation" and the various debates and discussions on this topic caused any changes toward more traditional grading, recording and averaging practices to be made? Are institutions of higher education utilizing more stringent policies in evaluating students than five years ago? There are some rather clear-cut answers to these questions in the data from the 1978-9 replication of the 1973-4 study although there are also some paradoxes.

In general, more stringent policies were noted in the use of nontraditional grading practices in any course, in making-up incompletes, in withdrawal policies, and in auditing procedures. The practices on the admission of high school graduates, admission to graduate school, and on remaining in good standing appear to have become more strict. The responses on probation and suspension of students indicate that utilization of these policies has changed to a more stringent approach. The increases noted on the changing of grades by administrators and/or appeal committees reflect less freedom for instructors in awarding grades. All of these reported changes toward most stringent measures have an effect on reducing grade inflation to some degree. One respondent's comment reflects this type of change:

> We have become more stringent in our grading practices. Standards have been elevated in classroom demands.

However, the increased use of nontraditional grades in courses out-

TABLE V

GPA REQUIREMENTS

Survey Item	1973-4 Survey Number of Responses	1973-4 Survey Percent of Responses	1978-9 Survey Number of Responses	1978-9 Survey Percent of Responses
36. A minimum high school GPA is required for admission of in-state students	116	21.7	97	21.9
37. A minimum high school GPA is required for admission of out-of-state students	145	26.7	116	26.2
*38. A minimum GPA is required for admission to graduate school	164	64.7	173	73.3
39. A minimum GPA is required for a student to be in good standing	395	72.6	353	79.7
40. A student is placed on probation when his/her overall GPA falls below the required minimum GPA	352	64.7	341	77.0
41. A student is placed on probation when any semester's GPA is below the required GPA	222	40.8	180	40.6
42. A student on probation is suspended when any semester's GPA is below the required minimum GPA	167	30.7	182	43.3
43. A student on probation remains on probation until his/her GPA is at or above the required minimum GPA as long as each semester's GPA is at or above the required minimum GPA	287	52.8	264	59.6
44. A minimum overall GPA is required for graduation from your institution	466	85.7	390	88.0

*In 1973-4, 164 out of 255 institutions with graduate schools responded to #38
In 1978-9, 173 out of 235 institutions with graduate schools responded to #38

side the major, the higher percentage of use of unlimited repeating of courses, and the increase in the practice of "academic bankruptcy" paradoxically indicate less-punitive grading practices. Also, the percent of respondents who indicated that the grade in a repeated course is used in place of the first grade when computing the GPA, though the 50.6% was less in 1978-9, tended to be less traditional and less stringent--particularly, when one considers the many respondents who indicated that "the highest grade earned is used in computing the GPA."

One over-riding factor which is evident in many responses in the 1978-9 study is the great and complex variety of policies and practices among different institutions of higher education and within such institutions. This complication is illustrated by one comment:

> We have 5 undergraduate schools and 6 graduate and professional schools and no two have identical grading practices!

Those who are involved in a similar situation can recognize the intricacies in these systems when dealing with grade inflation, with maintaining adequate and accurate records---and with responding to questionnaires.

The researchers consider that discussing "grade inflation" is another way of studying the problem of "GPA inflation" which is, to a great degree, the result of the practices studied in this report and, also, the result of the many differing policies and procedures which are prevalent in the institutions of higher education. Some representative comments from the 1978-9 respondents illustrate the two extremes of the continuum of grading practices in higher education.

> We have no "failing grade."
> Our optional system is CR/No Record; if grade earned is D or F, course is not recorded.
> We do not have F grade, the NC grade is recorded.
> We use non-punitive NC grade in lieu of "F" or "WF".
> We use P/NC instead of P/F.
> and
> A B C D NR (No record) system was adopted 1972, abolished 1977.
> N is used too leniently by most schools.
> We used NC (no credit) in place of "F" for a 2 or 3 year period about 6 yrs ago--it was a disaster. It did not penalize the student's GPA.
> We have recently gone from N to F.
> Use of N grade has been discontinued at this institution.

The researchers are not advocating abandoning nontraditional grading and less-punitive policies. Neither are they opposing nor approving the trend toward more stringent practices in grading, recording and averaging. The purpose of the researchers in this presentation is to report the comparative data from the 1978-9 replication of the 1973-4 study and to provide "A New Look at Grading, Recording and Averaging Practices in Higher Education in the United States."

Please note that the statistical significances of the differences were not computed. Inferences presented were derived from the percentage responses and the comments provided by many of the respondents.

REFERENCES

1. Janet R. Collins & K. N. Nickel, "A Study of Grading Practices in Institutions of Higher Education." ERIC, ED 097846. Abstracted in Research in Education, March, 1975, page 62.

2. Malcolm G. Scully, "Inflated Grades Worrying More and More Colleges," The Chronicle of Higher Education. May 19, 1975 Volume X, Number 13, page 1.

3. Ibid.

4. Press release from the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, January 14, 1977.

5. Martin Abramson, "The Sound of Musicgrams," TWA Ambassador. February, 1979, Volume 12, Number 2, page 64.

6. Alexander Astin, "Academic Credit As Achievement: A Critique," Proceedings from the Invitational Conference on the Uses of Credit in Higher Education. The University of Minnesota, Spring, 1974, page 26.